

Optimal Non-Universally Covariant Cloning

G. M. D'Ariano, P. Lo Presti

Theoretical Quantum Optics Group

Università degli Studi di Pavia and INFN Unità di Pavia

via A. Bassi 6, I-27100 Pavia, Italy

(February 1, 2008)

We consider non-universal cloning maps, namely cloning transformations which are covariant under a proper subgroup $\mathbf{G}$ of the universal unitary group $U(d)$, where d is the dimension of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ of the system to be cloned. We give a general method for optimizing cloning for any cost-function. Examples of applications are given for the phase-covariant cloning (cloning of equatorial qubits) and for the Weyl-Heisenberg group (cloning of “continuous variables”).

I. INTRODUCTION

The impossibility of perfectly cloning an unknown input state is a typical quantum feature [1], nonetheless, in the laws of quantum mechanics there's enough room either to systematically produce approximate copies [2] or to make perfect copies of orthogonal states [3] or of non-orthogonal ones with a non-unit probability [4]. These possibilities have been studied in several works [5–7].

Recently, quantum cloning has entered the realm of experimental physics [8] [9]. Moreover it has become interesting from a practical point of view, since it can be used to speed-up some quantum computations [10] or to perform some quantum measurements [11,12]. All these tasks require a spreading of the quantum information contained in a system into a larger system, and quantum cloning is a way to achieve such a spreading.

In this paper we will see how any “spreading” corresponds to a particular completely-positive (CP) map. By exploiting the correspondence between CP-maps and positive operators on the tensor product of the output and input spaces [13], we can parametrize all the possible spreading transformation. Then we focus on covariant CP-map, showing that quantum cloning is a particular case of permutation-covariance. By means of Schur's lemmas we completely characterize the positive operators corresponding to quantum cloning transformations. By the same technique, we characterize $\mathbf{G}$ -covariant cloning transformation, where $\mathbf{G}$ is any single-copy covariance group.

The parametrization of CP-maps, and in particular of cloning and covariant cloning, stands at the base of any further optimization. In fact, quantum cloning can be used to perform some tasks on the copies, and depending on what these copies will be used for, one defines a “goodness” criterion for the cloning process and optimizes accordingly.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we briefly

describe a quantum cloning transformation and its relation to CP-maps. Sec. III is devoted to the description of CP-maps in terms of positive operators, while in Sec. IV we treat the case of covariant CP-maps, giving their parametrization with suitable covariant positive operators. In Sec. V we use the previously explained techniques to deal with cloning optimization, focusing on the covariant case.

II. CLONING TRANSFORMATIONS

In a quantum cloning transformation, the input state $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is processed in order to produce N output clones (throughout the paper $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ will denote the vector space of linear bounded operators on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$). This requires a “spreading” of ρ into the joint state $\rho' \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N})$ of N identical quantum systems. The most general setup for such purpose is the following. Initially, ρ is encoded in a quantum system S_1 , while $N-1$ equivalent systems S_i , $i = 2 \dots N$, are prepared in a fixed state $|\omega\rangle_{(N-1)}$. An auxiliary system E is provided in a state $|e\rangle$, in order to make the whole system isolated. A unitary transformation U acts on the overall state producing the output

$$\Lambda = U \rho \otimes (|\omega\rangle\langle\omega|)_{(N-1)} \otimes |e\rangle\langle e| U^\dagger. \quad (1)$$

By taking the partial trace of Λ on the auxiliary system, we get the joint state ρ' of the N output systems S_i . This state will eventually support the clones. Upon calculating the trace with respect to a chosen basis $\{|j\rangle_E\}$ for $\mathcal{H}_E$ one has

$$\rho'_j = \sum_{j=1}^{\dim \mathcal{H}_E} {}_E \langle j | \Lambda | j \rangle_E = \sum_{j=1}^{\dim \mathcal{H}_E} A_j \rho A_j^\dagger \doteq \mathcal{E}(\rho), \quad (2)$$

where $A_j = {}_E \langle j | U | \omega \rangle_{(N-1)} | e \rangle_E$.

The map $\rho \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\rho)$ in Eq. (2) is a completely-positive (CP) and trace-preserving linear map from $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ to $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N})$. Trace preserving CP-maps generally describe the evolution of open quantum systems. To understand the general features of quantum cloning and for sake of optimization, it is convenient to treat these maps at an abstract level: a realization theorem guarantees that any CP-map can be achieved as a unitary transformation on an extended Hilbert space [16,17], similarly to Eq. (1). CP-maps will be shortly reviewed in the next session.

III. CP-MAPS AND POSITIVE OPERATORS

A linear map $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K})$ is completely-positive if its trivial extension $\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{H}'}$ to $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}')$ is positive, for any $\mathcal{H}'$ ($\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{H}'}$ denoting the trivial map on $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}')$).

Here we recall a convenient notation [14]. Fixing two orthonormal basis $\{|i\rangle_1\}$ and $\{|j\rangle_2\}$ for $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ respectively, any vector $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ can be written as

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{ij} c_{ij} |i\rangle_1 |j\rangle_2 \doteq |C\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where $C = \sum_{ij} c_{ij} |i\rangle_1 \langle j| \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_1)$ is a linear bounded operator from $\mathcal{H}_2$ to $\mathcal{H}_1$.

The following relations can be easily verified

$$A \otimes B |C\rangle = |ACB^T\rangle, \quad (4)$$

$$\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_2} [|A\rangle \langle B|] = AB^\dagger \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_1). \quad (5)$$

For every CP-map $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K})$ we define the positive operator $R_{\mathcal{E}}$ in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H})$

$$R_{\mathcal{E}} \doteq \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{I} (|\mathbf{1}\rangle \langle \mathbf{1}|), \quad (6)$$

where $\mathcal{I}$ denotes the identical map over the extension space $\mathcal{H}$, and for the vector $|\mathbf{1}\rangle \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ we used the notation (3) for $\Psi = \mathbf{1}$ the identity matrix with respect to a fixed basis on $\mathcal{H}$. The action of $\mathcal{E}$ on $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [\mathbf{1} \otimes \rho^T R_{\mathcal{E}}], \quad (7)$$

where the transposition $\rho \rightarrow \rho^T$ is performed with respect to the same fixed basis. In fact, substituting Eq. (6) in Eq. (7), one has

$$\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [\mathbf{1} \otimes \rho^T R_{\mathcal{E}}] = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [\mathbf{1} \otimes \rho^T \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{I} (|\mathbf{1}\rangle \langle \mathbf{1}|)].$$

Then, it is possible to take the factor $\mathbf{1} \otimes \rho^T$ inside the CP-map $\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{I}$, since they act independently on different spaces. By applying Eq. (4), one obtains

$$\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [\mathbf{1} \otimes \rho^T R_{\mathcal{E}}] = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{I} (|\rho\rangle \langle \mathbf{1}|)],$$

and thus, commuting the partial trace with $\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{I}$, and using Eq. (5), one finally gets Eq. (7).

The operator $R_{\mathcal{E}}$ is the only one for which Eq. (7) holds true. In fact, suppose $R_{\mathcal{E}}$ and R' give the same CP-map $\mathcal{E}$ by means of Eq. (7), then

$$\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [\mathbf{1} \otimes \rho^T (R_{\mathcal{E}} - R')] = 0 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}), \quad \forall \rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}).$$

Since an operator $O \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K})$ is null if $\langle v|O|v\rangle = 0 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K})$ for all $|v\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$, it follows that $R_{\mathcal{E}} = R'$. Thus, the correspondence from CP-maps to positive operators is “into”.

Since $R_{\mathcal{E}}$ is positive, it can be written as

$$R_{\mathcal{E}} = \sum_i |A_i\rangle \langle A_i|, \quad (8)$$

where there are many different choices of the vectors $|A_i\rangle$, which are not necessarily eigenvectors of $R_{\mathcal{E}}$, and generally are not normalized.

Substituting this relation in Eq. (7) and remembering that $A_i \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$, we find

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \sum_i \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [\mathbf{1} \otimes \rho^T |A_i\rangle \langle A_i|] = \sum_i A_i \rho A_i^\dagger, \quad (9)$$

thus recovering that any CP-map admits different Kraus’s decompositions [16], depending on the choice of the vectors $|A_i\rangle$ in Eq. (8).

Clearly, Eq. (8) holds for any positive operator R on $\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H}$. The map defined by R through Eq. (7) is completely-positive, since it can be expressed in the form of Eq. (9) which trivially gives a CP-map. Then the correspondence from CP-maps to operators is also “onto”.

Concluding, Eq. (7) defines a one-to-one correspondence between CP-maps from $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ to $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K})$ and positive operators on $\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H}$. By exploiting this correspondence, properties of $\mathcal{E}$ can be translated into properties of $R_{\mathcal{E}}$. For example, the trace-preserving condition for $\mathcal{E}$

$$\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{K}} [\mathcal{E}(\rho)] = 1 = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [\rho^T \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{K}} [R_{\mathcal{E}}]],$$

for all $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\text{Tr}[\rho] = 1$, becomes

$$\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{K}} [R_{\mathcal{E}}] = \mathbf{1} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}). \quad (10)$$

In the following, it will be useful to consider the dual map $\mathcal{E}^\vee$ of a CP-map $\mathcal{E}$, namely the transformation in the Heisenberg picture versus the Schrödinger picture map $\rho \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\rho)$. The dual map $\mathcal{E}^\vee$ is defined by the identity

$$\text{Tr} [\rho \mathcal{E}^\vee(O)] = \text{Tr} [\mathcal{E}(\rho) O], \quad (11)$$

which must be valid for all operators $O \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K})$. In terms of the operator $R_{\mathcal{E}}$ one has

$$\mathcal{E}^\vee(O) = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{K}} [O \otimes \mathbf{1} R_{\mathcal{E}}^{T_{\mathcal{H}}}], \quad (12)$$

where $T_{\mathcal{H}}$ denotes partial transposition on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ only [15].

In the next session, the correspondence $\mathcal{E} \leftrightarrow R_{\mathcal{E}}$ will be applied to the covariance condition for a CP-map, which turns out to be the key idea to deal with cloning and covariant cloning.

IV. COVARIANT CP-MAPS

Let $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K})$ be a CP-map, and let $\mathbf{G}$ be a group with unitary representations U and V on $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{K}$ respectively. $\mathcal{E}$ is $\mathbf{G}$ -covariant with respect to U and V if

$$\mathcal{E}(U_g \rho U_g^\dagger) = V_g \mathcal{E}(\rho) V_g^\dagger, \quad (13)$$

for any $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ and $g \in \mathbf{G}$.

By means of Eq. (7), the covariance condition becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(\rho) &= \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}[\mathbf{1} \otimes \rho^T R_{\mathcal{E}}] = \\ &\equiv \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}[\mathbf{1} \otimes \rho^T V_g^\dagger \otimes U_g^T R_{\mathcal{E}} V_g \otimes U_g^*].\end{aligned}\quad (14)$$

From the uniqueness of the operator associated to a CP-map, we conclude that $\mathcal{E}$ is $\mathbf{G}$ -covariant if and only if

$$R_{\mathcal{E}} = V_g^\dagger \otimes U_g^T R_{\mathcal{E}} V_g \otimes U_g^*, \quad \forall g \in \mathbf{G}, \quad (15)$$

or equivalently

$$[R_{\mathcal{E}}, V_g \otimes U_g^*] = 0, \quad \forall g \in \mathbf{G}. \quad (16)$$

Thus, $\mathbf{G}$ -covariance of a CP-map $\mathcal{E}$ is equivalent to $\mathbf{G}$ -invariance of the corresponding positive operator $R_{\mathcal{E}}$.

Group invariant operators

The $\mathbf{G}$ -representation $W = \text{diag}(V \otimes U^*)$ on $\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H}$, defined as $W_g = V_g \otimes U_g^*$, is generally reducible, i. e. the space can be decomposed into a direct sum of minimal invariant subspaces $\mathcal{M}_i$

$$\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{i=1} \mathcal{M}_i, \quad (17)$$

each $\mathcal{M}_i$ supporting a unitary irreducible representation (UIR) of the group. Given this decomposition one can look at any operator O on $\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ as a set of operators O_j^i in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_j, \mathcal{M}_i)$, so that $O = \sum_{ij} O_j^i$.

Due to irreducibility of the subspaces $\mathcal{M}_i$, W_g will be decomposed as follows

$$(W_g)_j^i = \delta_{ij} T_g^j,$$

where T_g^j is the UIR supported by $\mathcal{M}_j$. Two UIR T^i and T^j are equivalent, $i \sim j$, if they are connected by similarity, i. e. through an isomorphism $I_j^i \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_j, \mathcal{M}_i)$ such that $T^j = (I_j^i)^{-1} T^i I_j^i$.

The invariance equation (15) becomes

$$T_g^i R_j^i T_g^j = R_j^i \quad \forall g \in \mathbf{G},$$

so that, by Schur's lemmas (see, for example, Ref. [18]), one finally has

$$R_j^i = c_{ij} I_j^i, \quad (18)$$

where if $i \approx j$ then $c_{ij} = 0$, and, if $i \sim j$, c_{ij} can be different from zero.

Since equivalent representations are related by similarity, in any invariant subspace $\mathcal{M}_i$ one can choose the basis $\{|i, l\rangle, l = 1 \dots \dim \mathcal{M}_i\}$ so that for $i \sim j$

$$\langle i, l | T^i | i, m \rangle = \langle j, l | T^j | j, m \rangle, \quad (19)$$

hence

$$I_j^i = \sum_l |i, l\rangle \langle j, l| \doteq \mathbf{1}_j^i, \quad (20)$$

and finally

$$R = \sum_{ij} c_{ij} \mathbf{1}_j^i. \quad (21)$$

In order to have a positive R , the matrix c_{ij} must be positive, since taking $|\psi\rangle = \sum_i \sum_{l=1}^{\dim \mathcal{M}_i} \psi_{il} |i, l\rangle$ one has

$$\langle\langle \psi | R | \psi \rangle\rangle = \sum_{ij} \sum_{l=1}^{\dim \mathcal{M}_i} \psi_{li}^* c_{ij} \psi_{lj}.$$

Recalling that $c_{ij} = 0$ if $i \approx j$, and reordering the indices of the representations by grouping the equivalent ones, the matrix c_{ij} assumes a block diagonal form, different blocks corresponding to inequivalent representations, each block including all representations equivalent to the same one. In this way, each block has dimension equal to the multiplicity of the representation. Positivity of R implies positivity of each block of matrix c_{ij} . This structure of c_{ij} is reflected on R by means of Eq. (21).

V. OPTIMAL COVARIANT CLONING

A cloning map is just a CP-map $\mathcal{C}$ from $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ to $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N})$ with the output copies invariant under the permutations of the N output spaces. This is equivalent to a particular covariance of the CP-map $\mathcal{C}$ for the group of permutations $\mathbf{S}_N$, namely it corresponds to the invariance of the positive operator $R_{\mathcal{C}}$ under the representation $W = \text{diag}(V \otimes I)$, where V is the representation of $\mathbf{S}_N$ permuting the N identical output spaces, and I (corresponding to U in Eq. (13)) is the $\mathbf{S}_N$ -trivial representation on the input space. One has

$$\mathcal{C}(\rho) = V_\pi \mathcal{C}(\rho) V_\pi^\dagger, \quad \forall \pi \in \mathbf{S}_N. \quad (22)$$

Notice that permutation covariance does not imply that the output state has support in the symmetric subspace of the output space $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N}$.

As explained in the previous section, Eq. (22) determines a peculiar block structure for the operator $R_{\mathcal{C}}$ associated to the map $\mathcal{C}$. Such a structure is strictly related to the decomposition of $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes(N+1)}$ into invariant subspaces for $V_\pi \otimes \mathbf{1}$. Any possible cloner is described by an $R_{\mathcal{C}}$ with that structure and satisfying the trace-preserving condition of Eq. (10). In this way, one classifies all possible cloning maps through the decomposition into irreducibles of the $\mathbf{S}_N$ -representation V on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N}$.

In addition to permutation invariance, in this paper we will consider covariance under a group of transformations $\mathbf{G}$, with representation T on $\mathcal{H}$. This corresponds to the following identity

$$\mathcal{C}(T_g \rho T_g^\dagger) = T_g^{\otimes N} \mathcal{C}(\rho) T_g^{\dagger \otimes N}. \quad (23)$$

One can choose a cost function $C(R_{\mathcal{C}})$ (related to the following usage of the clones). Covariant cloning is suited to invariant cost-functions of the form

$$C(R_C) \equiv C_0(\rho_0, R_C) = C_0(T_g \rho_0 T_g^\dagger, R_C), \quad (24)$$

where ρ_0 is the seed of the covariant family of states on which we are interested in having the minimum C_0 .

The best cloner is found by minimizing $C(R_C)$ vs R_C , with the constraints of positivity $R_C \geq 0$, trace-preserving (Eq. (10)), and covariance under permutations and $\mathbf{G}$ (Eqs. (22) and (23)).

VI. EXAMPLES

Phase covariant qubit cloning

Here, we consider the problem of cloning a qubit in a $U(1)$ -covariant fashion, where the group representation is given by

$$T_\phi = \exp \left[\frac{i}{2} \phi (\mathbf{1} - \sigma_z) \right]. \quad (25)$$

Since the cloning to two copies is already given in Ref. [19], whereas the general case for N copies is very complicated, here for simplicity we will consider the case of $N = 3$ copies. We want to achieve the maximum fidelity between input and clones, when the input is an equatorial qubit

$$|\psi_\phi\rangle = T_\phi \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|0\rangle + |1\rangle] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|0\rangle + e^{i\phi}|1\rangle]. \quad (26)$$

In other terms, we want to maximize the fidelity

$$\begin{aligned} F_\phi &= \text{Tr}[\mathcal{C}(|\psi_\phi\rangle\langle\psi_\phi|) |\psi_\phi\rangle\langle\psi_\phi|] \equiv F_0 = \\ &= \text{Tr}[\mathbf{1}^{\otimes 2} \otimes |\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0| \otimes (|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|)^T R_C]. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Since the equator is invariant even for spin flipping, here we will require the additional covariance with respect to the group $\mathbb{Z}_2$, with representation $\{\mathbf{1}, \sigma_x\}$.

In order to satisfy all the covariance requirements, R_C must be invariant for permutations, phase shift, and spin flip, i. e. for products of any of the following unitary operators

$$T_\phi^{\otimes 3} \otimes T_\phi^*, \quad V_\pi \otimes \mathbf{1}, \quad \sigma_x^{\otimes 3} \otimes \sigma_x^*.$$

The Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 3+1}$ can be decomposed into subspaces which are irreducible with respect to the joint action of $U(1)$ and $\mathbf{S}_3$, as shown in Table I.

Space	Unnormalized Basis	$U(1)$	$\mathbf{S}_3$	Flipped
-------	--------------------	--------	----------------	---------

$\mathcal{M}_1$	$ 0001\rangle$	-1	T	$\mathcal{M}_5$
$\mathcal{M}_2$	$ 0000\rangle$	0	T	$\mathcal{M}_6$
$\mathcal{M}_3$	$ 1001\rangle + 0101\rangle + 0011\rangle$	0	T	$\mathcal{M}_7$
$\mathcal{M}_4$	$ 1001\rangle - 0101\rangle, \frac{1}{2} 1001\rangle + \frac{1}{2} 0101\rangle - 0011\rangle$	0	D	$\mathcal{M}_8$
$\mathcal{M}_5$	$ 1110\rangle$	3	T	$\mathcal{M}_1$
$\mathcal{M}_6$	$ 1111\rangle$	2	T	$\mathcal{M}_2$
$\mathcal{M}_7$	$ 0110\rangle + 1010\rangle + 1100\rangle$	2	T	$\mathcal{M}_3$
$\mathcal{M}_8$	$ 0110\rangle - 1010\rangle, \frac{1}{2} 0110\rangle + \frac{1}{2} 1010\rangle - 1100\rangle$	2	D	$\mathcal{M}_4$
$\mathcal{M}_9$	$ 1000\rangle + 0100\rangle + 0010\rangle$	1	T	$\mathcal{M}_{10}$
$\mathcal{M}_{10}$	$ 0111\rangle + 1011\rangle + 1101\rangle$	1	T	$\mathcal{M}_9$
$\mathcal{M}_{11}$	$ 1000\rangle - 0100\rangle, \frac{1}{2} 1000\rangle + \frac{1}{2} 0100\rangle - 0010\rangle$	1	D	$\mathcal{M}_{12}$
$\mathcal{M}_{12}$	$ 0111\rangle - 1011\rangle, \frac{1}{2} 0111\rangle + \frac{1}{2} 1011\rangle - 1101\rangle$	1	D	$\mathcal{M}_{11}$

TABLE I. $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 3+1}$ decomposition into $U(1) - \mathbf{S}_3$ irreducibles. $U(1)$ acts on each subspace as a phase shift $e^{in\phi}$, where $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ (column III) labels inequivalent representation. $\mathbf{S}_3$ acts trivially (T) on one-dimensional subspaces, whereas on bidimensional ones it acts as the defining representation (D). Spin flipping connects subspaces (column V).

Looking at Table I, one can see that in this example the matrix c_{ij} defined in Sec. IV has the following positive diagonal blocks:

$$\{1\}, \{2,3\}, \{4\}, \{5\}, \{6,7\}, \{8\}, \{9,10\}, \{11,12\}.$$

To ensure spin flipping covariance, the elements of c_{ij} connected by a flip must be equal, for example $c_{23} = c_{67}$.

At the end, to fill the blocks of c_{ij} in the right way, we need the parameters $a, b, c, d, e, f, g \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, where $d \geq e$, $f \geq g$, and $c \geq \|\mathbf{v}\|$. Table II explains how to employ them.

Blocks	Content
$\{1\}, \{5\}$	a
$\{4\}, \{8\}$	b
$\{2,3\}, \{6,7\}$	$c\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \sigma$
$\{9,10\}$	$d\mathbf{1} + e\sigma_x$
$\{11,12\}$	$f\mathbf{1} + g\sigma_x$

TABLE II. Content of the blocks of the matrix c_{ij} , chosen in order to have R_C describing the most general CP-map from $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ to $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 3})$ which is covariant with respect to permutations, phase shift, and spin flip.

The parameters must satisfy another constraint given by the trace-preserving condition defined in Eq. (10). Within this parametrization it reads

$$a + 2b + 2c + d + 2f = 1. \quad (28)$$

Substituting this equation into the equatorial fidelity F_0 defined in Eq. (27), one has

$$F_0 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3}(e - g) + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}v_x. \quad (29)$$

This quantity can be easily maximized by hand, taking into account the constraint given by Eq. (28) and the properties of the parameters. The maximum fidelity is $F = \frac{5}{6}$ (see note [22]) and is achieved for $d = e = 1$ and all the other parameters equal to zero. The optimal phase covariant cloning is thus described by the operator

$$R_C^{opt} = |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|, \quad (30)$$

where

$$|\Phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}[|1000\rangle + |0100\rangle + |0010\rangle + |0111\rangle + |1011\rangle + |1101\rangle].$$

The Kraus's decomposition of the optimal cloner is $\mathcal{C}(\rho) = B \rho B^\dagger$, where

$$B = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}[|100\rangle\langle 0| + |010\rangle\langle 0| + |001\rangle\langle 0| + |011\rangle\langle 1| + |101\rangle\langle 1| + |110\rangle\langle 1|].$$

Cloning of continuous variables

The parametrization of CP-maps given in Sec. III and its specialization to the covariant case are useful tools for engineering measurements. The idea is to “spread” a quantum state on a larger system with a CP-map $\mathcal{E}$, and then to perform a measurement on the spread state. The connection between the POVM $\{M_i\}$ on the larger space $\mathcal{K}$ and the resulting one $\{M_i^\vee\}$ on $\mathcal{H}$ is given by

$$M_i^\vee = \mathcal{E}^\vee(M_i) \doteq \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{K}}[M_i \otimes \mathbf{1} R_{\mathcal{E}}^{T_{\mathcal{H}}}], \quad (31)$$

where $\mathcal{E}^\vee$ is the dual map of $\mathcal{E}$, and the symbol $T_{\mathcal{H}}$ stands for transposition with respect to $\mathcal{H}$ only (see Sec. III).

In Ref. [11], the cloning map for continuous variables of Ref. [20] is used to achieve the optimal POVM for the joint measurement of two conjugated quadratures X_0 and $X_{\frac{\pi}{2}}$ of an oscillator mode a (where $X_\phi = \frac{1}{2}[a^\dagger e^{i\phi} + a e^{-i\phi}]$) by measuring them separately on the two clones. Here, we will briefly show how our general method works on this problem.

Denote by $\mathcal{H}_3$ the input space and by $\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2$ the two output spaces of the oscillator modes a_3, a_1, a_2 respectively. The cloning is described by

$$R_C = \frac{1}{2}P_{12} \otimes \mathbf{1}_3 \mathbf{1}_1 \otimes (|\mathbf{1}\rangle\langle\mathbf{1}|)_{23} P_{12} \otimes \mathbf{1}_3, \quad (32)$$

where $P = V|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \mathbf{1} V^\dagger$, and V is the 50% beam splitter unitary transformation $V = \exp[\frac{\pi}{4}(a_1^\dagger a_2 - a_1 a_2^\dagger)]$.

A simple calculation shows that

$$P = \frac{2}{\pi} \int d^2\alpha |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|^{\otimes 2}, \quad (33)$$

where $|\alpha\rangle = D(\alpha)|0\rangle$, and $D(\alpha) = e^{\alpha a^\dagger - \bar{\alpha} a}$ is the displacement operator generating the *Weyl-Heisenberg* (*WH*) group. By means of Eq. (33), the invariance of R_C defined in Eq. (32) with respect to permutations and displacements can be easily verified.

Using the dual cloning map as in Eq. (31), we should check that

$$\mathcal{C}^\vee(E_x^0 \otimes E_y^{\pi/2}) = \frac{1}{\pi} |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|, \quad \alpha = x + iy, \quad (34)$$

where $E_v^\phi = |v\rangle_\phi \langle v|$, and $X_\phi|v\rangle_\phi = v|v\rangle_\phi$. In fact, the last term of Eq. (34) is the well-known optimal POVM for the joint measurement of conjugated quadratures, whereas E_v^ϕ is the POVM of the ϕ -quadrature measurement. Hence identity (34) guarantees that the cloning achieves the optimal joint measurement of the two conjugated quadrature via commuting measurements on clones.

Noticing that

$$E_x^0 \otimes E_y^{\pi/2} = D(\alpha)^{\otimes 2} E_0^0 \otimes E_0^{\pi/2} D(\alpha)^{\otimes 2\dagger}, \quad (35)$$

and exploiting the *WH* covariance, Eq. (34) reduces to

$$\mathcal{C}^\vee(E_0^0 \otimes E_0^{\pi/2}) = \frac{1}{\pi} |0\rangle\langle 0|. \quad (36)$$

Substituting Eq. (31) into this last equation, and taking matrix elements $\langle i | \dots | j \rangle$, one finally must check that

$${}_0\langle 0 | \frac{\pi}{2} \langle 0 | \langle i | R_C | 0 \rangle_0 | 0 \rangle_{\frac{\pi}{2}} | j \rangle = \frac{1}{\pi} \delta_{i0} \delta_{j0}. \quad (37)$$

Since $V|0\rangle_0|0\rangle_{\frac{\pi}{2}} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}|\mathbf{1}\rangle$ and $V|0\rangle_0|0\rangle = |0\rangle_0|0\rangle$ (see Ref. [21]), one has that $P|0\rangle_{\frac{\pi}{2}}|0\rangle_0 = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}|0\rangle_0|0\rangle$. Thus Eq. (37) holds, and the cloning really achieves the wanted POVM.

Universal cloning

Clearly, the universal covariant cloning of Werner [6] is a special case of covariant cloning for the covariance group $U(d)$, $d = \dim \mathcal{H}$, of all unitary operators on $\mathcal{H}$. Here, for sake of comparison to Ref. [6], we consider more generally the cloning from M to $N > M$ copies. Hence the cloning is a CP-map $\mathcal{C}$ from $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes M})$ to $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N})$ such that for any $U \in U(d)$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$

$$\mathcal{C}(U^{\otimes M} \sigma^{\otimes M} U^{\dagger \otimes M}) = U^{\otimes N} \mathcal{C}(\sigma^{\otimes M}) U^{\dagger \otimes N}. \quad (38)$$

The cost-function for optimization is the (negative) fidelity between clones and input

$$C(R_C) = -F = -\text{Tr}[\sigma^{\otimes N} \mathcal{C}(\sigma^{\otimes M})], \quad (39)$$

where σ is pure. Owing to covariance, the fidelity F does not depend on σ , since any pure state lies in the $U(d)$ orbit of any other pure state.

The optimal cloning map of Ref. [6] is given by

$$\mathcal{C}(\rho) = \frac{d(M)}{d(N)} S_N (\rho \otimes \mathbf{1}^{\otimes (N-M)}) S_N, \quad (40)$$

where $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes M})$, S_N is the projector on the symmetric subspace $\mathcal{H}_+^{\otimes N}$, and $d(N) = \dim(\mathcal{H}_+^{\otimes N})$. In our framework, one has

$$R_C = \frac{d(M)}{d(N)} \tilde{S} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes (N-M)}} (|\mathbf{1}\rangle\rangle\langle\langle\mathbf{1}|)_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes (M+M)}} \tilde{S}, \quad (41)$$

where $\tilde{S} = S_N \otimes \mathbf{1}^{\otimes M}$. It can be easily verified that R_C is both covariant and permutation invariant as it must be.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work has been supported by the Italian Ministero dell'Università e della Ricerca Scientifica e Tecnologica (MURST) under the co-sponsored project 1999 *Quantum Information Transmission And Processing: Quantum Teleportation And Error Correction*.

-
- [1] W. K. Woiters and W. H. Zurek, *Nature (London)* **299**, 802 (1982).
 - [2] V. Bužek and M. Hillery, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 1844 (1996).
 - [3] H. P. Yuen, *Phys. Lett. A* **113**, 405 (1986).
 - [4] L.-M. Duan and G.-C. Guo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 4999 (1998).
 - [5] N. Gisin and S. Massar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 2153 (1997).
 - [6] R. F. Werner, *Phys. Rev. A* **58**, 1827 (1998).
 - [7] D. Bruß, A. Ekert, and C. Macchiavello, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 2598 (1998).
 - [8] C. Simon, G. Weihs, and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 2993 (2000).
 - [9] G. M. D'Ariano, F. De Martini, and M. F. Sacchi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 1754 (2000).
 - [10] E. Galvao and L. Hardy, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 22301 (2000).
 - [11] G. M. D'Ariano, C. Macchiavello, and M. F. Sacchi, *quant-ph/0007062*.
 - [12] D. Bruß, J. Calsamiglia, and N. Lütkenhaus, *quant-ph/0011073*.
 - [13] A. Jamiolkowski, *Rep. of Math. Phys.* No. 4, **3** (1972).

- [14] See, for example, G. M. D'Ariano, P. Lo Presti, and M. F. Sacchi *Phys. Lett. A* **272**, 32 (2000).
- [15] Remember that transposition is not a CP-map, hence partial transposition is not a positive map. Thus the partial transposition of a positive operator can be non-positive.
- [16] K. Kraus, *States, Effects, and Operations* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983).
- [17] M. Ozawa, *J. Math. Phys.* **25**, 79 (1984).
- [18] H. F. Jones, *Groups, representations, and Physics* (Institute of Physics Publishing, Bristol and Philadelphia, 1990).
- [19] D. Bruß, M. Cinchetti, G. M. D'Ariano, and C. Macchiavello, *Phys. Rev. A* **62** 012302 (2000).
- [20] N. J. Cerf, A. Ipe, and X. Rottenberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 1754 (2000).
- [21] G. M. D'Ariano, and M. F. Sacchi, *Mod. Phys. Lett. B* **11**, 1263 (1997).
- [22] We notice that this fidelity value is larger than the bound given in Ref. [19]. The correctness of the present value and the optimality of the map can be checked a posteriori.